

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1, 4-10, and 21-30 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects claims 1-5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,430 (Ono) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,344 (Eastlund). Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) over Ono in view of Eastlund and U.S. Patent No. 6,307,321 (Honda). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) over Ono and Eastlund in view of Honda and U.S. Patent No. 6,054,811 (Genz). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-10 and 21-30 are patentable over Ono, Eastlund, Honda and Genz for at least the following reasons.

Ono is directed to a high pressure discharge lamp having a pair of electrodes with a spacing of 0.5mm to 2.0mm. As correctly noted on page 3 of the Office Action, Ono does not disclose or suggest a mercury density in the lamp vessel is higher than 0.3 mg/mm³.

Eastlund does not cure the deficiencies of Ono. Eastlund recites on column 11, lines 21-23, a mercury density in the lamp vessel is between 10mg/cm³ and 600mg/cm³, which is .01mg/mm³ to 0.6mg/mm³.

In contrast, independent claims 1 and 21 recite, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the distance d between the electrode tips is from 0.3
to 0.8 mm.

A distance between two electrodes as small as 0.3 mm is not taught or suggested by Eastlund or Ono, either individually or in combination. Rather, the Ono teaches that the smallest electrode distance is 0.5 mm.

Nor do the cited references, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 28, which include (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the ionizable discharge medium includes mercury
having a density from 0.3 to 0.8 mg/mm³.

An ionizable discharge medium that includes mercury having a density up to 0.8 mg/mm³ is nowhere disclosed or suggested by Ono, Eastlund, or combination thereof. Rather, the Eastlund discloses that mercury density is up to 0.6 mg/mm³.

Honda and Genz likewise do not remedy the deficiencies in Ono and Eastlund.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 21 and 28 are patentable over the cited references, and claims 4-10, 20-27 and 29-30 are patentable at least because they depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 21 and 28.

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric M. Bram/
Eric M. Bram
Reg. 37,285
Att'y for Applicant(s)
Philips Intellectual Property
& Standards

P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9635
Fax: (914) 332-0615

(HAL/EMB)